

Appl. No. 10/700,810
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML
Amdt. Dated 01/19/2006
Reply to Office Action of 10/19/2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 27-32 are currently being considered. Claim 1 is being amended to remove the nitrogen free polymers of (c3). Claim 15 is canceled without prejudice. Claims 27-32 are being added. Support for new Claims 27-32 can be found in Claims 1 and at page 11, lines 32 to page 12 line 13. No additional claim fee is believed due.

Claim Objection

Claim 15 has been objected to as being informal as it is dependent upon a canceled claim, namely Claim 14. Applicants are canceling Claim 15 without prejudice, thereby rendering this objection moot. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

a) US 6,827,795 (Kasturi)

Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) over US 6,827,795 (hereafter Kasturi) for reasons of record at pages 2 and 3 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) all of the elements of that claim must be found in the prior art reference, in this instance Kasturi. However, a review of present Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 will clearly show this is not the case, as not all elements of Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are found in Kasturi. Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended clarify that the fabric care ingredients comprise one or more cationic silicone polymers. There is simply no disclosure of this claim element in Kasturi.

As to new Claims 27-32, Kasturi is wholly silent as to linear cationic silicone block copolymers, let alone linear cationic silicone block copolymers, comprising non-fabric

Appl. No. 10/700,810
Aux. Docket No. CM2707ML
Amdt. Dated 01/19/2006
Reply to Office Action of 10/19/2005
Customer No. 27752

substantive loops and fabric substantive hooks. There is simply no disclosure of these claim elements of Claim 27 and consequently dependent Claims 28-32, in Kasturi.

Since Kasturi fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

b) US 6,028,041 (Decoster '041)

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) over US 6,028,041 (hereafter Decoster '041) for reasons of record at page 3 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) all of the elements of that claim must be found in the prior art reference, in this instance Decoster '041. However, a review of present Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 will clearly show this is not the case, as not all elements of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are found in Decoster '041. Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended clarify that the fabric care ingredients comprise one or more cationic silicone polymers. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of either of these claim elements in Decoster '041.

As to new Claims 27-32, Decoster '041 is wholly silent as to linear cationic silicone block copolymers, let alone linear cationic silicone block copolymers, comprising non-fabric substantive loops and fabric substantive hooks. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 27-32 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of any of these claim elements of Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-32, in Decoster '041.

Since Decoster '041 fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 12 and 19 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/700,810
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML
Amdt. Dated 01/19/2006
Reply to Office Action of 10/19/2005
Customer No. 27752

c) US 5,656,257 (Fealy)

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) over US 5,656,257 (hereafter Fealy) for reasons of record at pages 3 and 4 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) all of the elements of that claim must be found in the prior art reference, in this instance Fealy. However, a review of present Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 will clearly show this is not the case, as not all elements of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are found in Fealy. Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended clarify that the fabric care ingredients comprise one or more cationic silicone polymers. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of either of these claim elements in Fealy.

As to new Claims 27-32, Fealy is wholly silent as to linear cationic silicone block copolymers, let alone linear cationic silicone block copolymers, comprising non-fabric substantive loops and fabric substantive hooks. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 27-31 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of any of these claim elements of Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-32, in Fealy.

Since Fealy fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 12 and 19 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

d) US 6,551,970 (Decoster '970)

Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) over US 6,551,970 (hereafter Decoster '970) for reasons of record at page 4 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

Appl. No. 10/700,810
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML
Amdt. Dated 01/19/2006
Reply to Office Action of 10/19/2005
Customer No. 27752

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) all of the elements of that claim must be found in the prior art reference, in this instance Decoster '970. However, a review of present Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 will clearly show this is not the case, as not all elements of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are found in Decoster '970. Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended clarify that the fabric care ingredients comprise one or more cationic silicone polymers. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of either of these claim elements in Decoster '970.

As to new Claims 27-32, Decoster '970 is wholly silent as to linear cationic silicone block copolymers, let alone linear cationic silicone block copolymers, comprising non-fabric substantive loops and fabric substantive hooks. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 27-32 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of any of these claim elements of Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-32, in Decoster '970.

Since Decoster '970 fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

e) US 6,562,772 (Maurin)

Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) over US 6,562,772 (hereafter Maurin) for reasons of record at pages 4 and 5 of the Final Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it may apply to the claims as now amended.

For a claim to be anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) all of the elements of that claim must be found in the prior art reference, in this instance Maurin. However, a review of present Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 will clearly show this is not the case, as not all elements of Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 are found in Maurin. Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 have been amended clarify that the fabric care ingredients comprise one or more cationic silicone polymers. Furthermore, the

Page 16 of 17

Appl. No. 10/700,810
Atty. Docket No. CM2707ML
Amtd. Dated 01/19/2005
Reply to Office Action of 10/19/2005
Customer No. 27752

As to new Claims 27-32, Maurin is wholly silent as to linear cationic silicone block copolymers, let alone linear cationic silicone block copolymers, comprising non-fabric substantive loops and fabric substantive hooks. Furthermore, the compositions of Claims 27-32 are all liquid laundry detergents. There is simply no disclosure of any of these claim elements of Claim 27, and consequently dependent Claims 28-32, in Maurin.

Since Maurin fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 1, and consequently dependent Claims 1, 2, 10-13, 15-17 and 19 it does not anticipate the pending claims and therefore it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish their invention from the applied prior art.

WHEREFORE, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments presented, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the objection, and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and allowance of Claims 1-4, 10-13, 15-17, 19 and 27-32.

Respectfully Submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By Ian Robinson

Ian S. Robinson
Registration No. 43,348
(513) 627-4959

Date: January 19, 2005
Customer No. 27752